

Janet Napolitano
Governor

Todd F. Lang
Executive Director



Marcia J. Busching
Chair

Ermila Jolley
Gary Scaramazzo
Clark R. Dierks
Commissioners

State of Arizona
Citizens Clean Elections Commission

1616 W. Adams - Suite 110 - Phoenix, Arizona 85007 - Tel (602) 364-3477 - Fax (602) 364-3487 - www.azcleelections.gov

MEMORANDUM

To: Commissioners

From: Mike Becker, Voter Education Manager

Date: March 2, 2006

Subject: Behavior Research Center, Inc. Survey

In November 2005 the Commission approved the education budget for 2006. Part of the plan discussed the issuance of an "Awareness and Attitude" survey about the Citizens Clean Elections Commission. In January 2006 Behavior Research Center Inc. (BRC) was contacted to proceed with the six question survey. Attached please find the questions and the results of the survey by BRC.

OFF MADISON AVENUE CCEC STUDY (26022)
QUESTIONNAIRE

Second Draft - for Discussion Only

1. Thinking about legislative and statewide elections here in Arizona, would you say that you are very familiar, somewhat familiar, not very familiar or not at all familiar with the election funding program called Clean Elections?

___ Very familiar
___ Somewhat familiar
___ Not very familiar
___ Not at all familiar/never heard of (SKIP TO Q___)
___ Don't know/refused (SKIP TO Q___)

- 1a. As far as you can remember, where did you hear about Clean Elections? (PRE-CODE; RECORD ALL MENTIONS)

___ Newspapers
___ Radio news
___ Radio advertising
___ TV news
___ TV advertising
___ Mailings/flyers
___ Internet
___ Buses/vehicle signs
___ Word of mouth
___ Other (SPECIFY)_____
___ Don't know/refused

2. As far as you know, what does Clean Elections do? (PRE-CODE; RECORD ALL MENTIONS; PROBE; WHAT ELSE?)

___ Provide funding to candidates
___ Police/oversee the electoral process
___ Endorse certain candidates
___ Other (SPECIFY)_____
___ Nothing/don't know/refused

3. Do you feel a candidate who runs for office under Clean Elections guidelines and uses public funding is more credible or less credible than a candidate who raises his own money, or does it make no difference to you?
- ☐ More credible
 - ☐ No difference
 - ☐ Less credible
 - ☐ Don't know/refused
4. When a candidate for office violates the spending limit, how should that person be penalized? Should they be removed from office, fined or be required to repay the amount that is over the limit?
- ☐ Removed from office
 - ☐ Fined
 - ☐ Repay amount over the limit
 - ☐ Don't know/refused
5. Do you think it is very important, somewhat important, not very important or not at all important to voters in Arizona that the Clean Election Act continue?
- ☐ Very important
 - ☐ Somewhat important
 - ☐ Not very important
 - ☐ Not at all important
 - ☐ Don't know/refused
6. What, specifically, makes you say that? (PROBE & CLARIFY; BE SPECIFIC; RECORD ALL MENTIONS)
-

AWARENESS AND ATTITUDE STUDY

January 2006

Prepared for

Off Madison Ave and
Arizona Citizens Clean Elections Commission

Prepared by

Behavior Research Center, Inc.
1101 North First Street
Phoenix, Arizona 85004
(602) 258-4554



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION	1
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	2
DETAILED FINDINGS	3
FAMILIARITY WITH CLEAN ELECTIONS PROGRAM	3
SOURCES OF CLEAN ELECTIONS AWARENESS	5
PERCEIVED FUNCTIONS OF CLEAN ELECTIONS	6
CREDIBILITY OF CLEAN ELECTIONS CANDIDATES	7
PENALTIES FOR VIOLATING CLEAN ELECTIONS	8
IMPORTANCE OF THE CLEAN ELECTIONS ACT	9

INTRODUCTION

This report was commissioned by Off Madison Ave on behalf of the Arizona Citizens Clean Elections Commission and conducted by Behavior Research Center (BRC). The purpose of the study was to measure awareness of, and attitudes toward, the Citizens Clean Elections Commission.

The information contained in this report is based on 703 in-depth interviews with adult heads of household throughout Arizona. Interviewing was conducted in January 2006, by professional interviewers at BRC's state-of-the-art Computer-Assisted Telephone Interviewing (CATI) facility in Phoenix, where each interviewer worked under the direct supervision of BRC supervisory personnel. Interviews were conducted during a cross-section of late afternoon, evening and weekend hours to ensure that all households had a roughly equal opportunity of being called.

Prior to beginning the interviewing, each interviewer received a thorough briefing on the particulars of the study. During the briefing, the interviewers were trained on (a) the purpose of the study, (b) sampling procedures, (c) administration of the questionnaire, (d) probing protocols for open-ended questions and (e) other project-related issues. In addition, each interviewer completed a series of practice interviews to ensure that all procedures were understood and followed.

When analyzing the results of this survey, it should be kept in mind that all surveys are subject to sampling error. Sampling error, simply stated, is the difference between the results obtained from a sample and those that would be obtained by surveying the entire population under consideration. The overall sampling error for this survey at a 95 percent confidence interval is approximately +/-3.8 percent.

Behavior Research Center has presented all of the data germane to the basic research objectives of the project. However, if Off Madison Ave management requires additional data retrieval or interpretation, we stand ready to provide such input.

BEHAVIOR RESEARCH CENTER

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Major findings from this study include:

- Half of Arizona heads of household are unaware of the Clean Elections Act. However, two-thirds of high-efficacy voters are familiar with the program.
- Among those familiar with Clean Elections, support for continuing the program is very widespread, with 85 percent calling the program important to the voters of the state.
- Provision of funding and oversight of the electoral process are the main roles of Clean Elections in the minds of those who are aware of the program.
- Six in ten indicate that whether a candidate is “clean” makes no difference as to his/her credibility, but one-fourth feel a “clean” candidate is more credible, while just one in ten feel a “clean” candidate is less credible.
- Almost half feel a spending limit violator should be required to repay the amount spent that is over the limit, while three in ten feel that candidate should be removed from office.
- Stories in newspapers and on television news are the main sources of information on Clean Elections.

DETAILED FINDINGS

FAMILIARITY WITH CLEAN ELECTIONS PROGRAM

Half (49%) of all respondents know nothing at all or have never heard of the Clean Elections program and fewer than one in ten (8%) profess to be very familiar with it. However, among high-efficacy voters, overall awareness rises to two-thirds (67%), and over half are very (14%) or somewhat (41%) familiar with the program.

As may be seen in Table 1, women, younger respondents, Democrats and minorities are least familiar with Clean Elections. In addition, we note that Maricopa County residents are more aware of the program than are Pima County or rural residents. This may trace to the news coverage, centered in Maricopa County, over the case of Representative Smith and the challenge to his seat.

TABLE 1

"Thinking about legislative and statewide elections here in Arizona, would you say that you are very familiar, somewhat familiar, not very familiar or not at all familiar with the election funding program called Clean Elections?"

	Very Familiar	Somewhat Familiar	Not Very Familiar	Not At All Familiar/ Never Heard Of
TOTAL	8%	32%	11%	49%
<u>GENDER</u>				
Male	9	37	12	42
Female	7	26	9	58
<u>AGE</u>				
Under 35	2	24	7	67
35 to 54	8	34	13	45
55+	14	38	11	37
<u>POLITICAL PARTY</u>				
Republican	11	36	12	41
Democrat	6	31	11	52
Independent/Other	10	42	9	39
High Efficacy Voter	14	41	12	33
<u>ETHNICITY</u>				
Caucasian	9	36	11	44
Hispanic	3	18	15	64
Other	5	22	5	68
<u>COUNTY</u>				
Maricopa	10	33	12	45
Pima	6	28	8	58
Rural	4	30	9	57

~~~~~



Table 2 reconfigures the percentages who are very familiar, somewhat familiar and not very familiar by dropping out those who are completely unfamiliar with Clean Elections. Again, high-efficacy voters are more familiar with the program than are other groups.

TABLE 2

Percentage of Those With Some Awareness of Clean Elections

|                        | Very<br>Familiar | Somewhat<br>Familiar | Not Very<br>Familiar |
|------------------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| TOTAL                  | 16%              | 63%                  | 21%                  |
| <u>GENDER</u>          |                  |                      |                      |
| Male                   | 15               | 64                   | 21                   |
| Female                 | 17               | 61                   | 22                   |
| <u>AGE</u>             |                  |                      |                      |
| Under 35               | 6                | 71                   | 23                   |
| 35 to 54               | 14               | 62                   | 24                   |
| 55+                    | 22               | 60                   | 18                   |
| <u>POLITICAL PARTY</u> |                  |                      |                      |
| Republican             | 18               | 62                   | 20                   |
| Democrat               | 12               | 64                   | 24                   |
| Independent/Other      | 17               | 69                   | 14                   |
| High Efficacy Voter    | 22               | 61                   | 17                   |
| <u>ETHNICITY</u>       |                  |                      |                      |
| Caucasian              | 17               | 63                   | 20                   |
| Hispanic               | 8                | 50                   | 42                   |
| Other                  | 16               | 68                   | 16                   |
| <u>COUNTY</u>          |                  |                      |                      |
| Maricopa               | 18               | 60                   | 22                   |
| Pima                   | 15               | 65                   | 20                   |
| Rural                  | 10               | 70                   | 20                   |

~~~~~

SOURCES OF CLEAN ELECTIONS AWARENESS

Those who are aware of Clean Elections get most of their information about the program from stories in newspapers (35%) and television news (28%). Radio news (17%) and word of mouth (11%) also register in double digits.

TABLE 3

"As far as you can remember, where did you hear about Clean Elections?"
(PRE-CODE; RECORD ALL MENTIONS)

Among Those With An Awareness of Clean Elections

	TOTAL	Maricopa	Pima	Rural
Newspapers	35%	37%	26%	34%
TV news	28	27	34	23
Radio news	17	19	10	15
Word of mouth	11	10	17	12
Mailings/Flyer	6	6	8	5
TV ads	4	4	7	1
Political functions// Sample ballots	3	3	3	6
Radio ads	3	4	4	0
Tax forms	2	2	*	1
Internet	1	1	3	0
Other	1	2	0	0
Not sure	12	11	12	15

* Indicates less than .5 of one percent

Total exceeds 100% due to multiple responses

~~~~~

## PERCEIVED FUNCTIONS OF CLEAN ELECTIONS

Almost four in ten (37%) of those who are aware of Clean Elections identify funding of candidates as the principle role of the program, while another one-fourth (25%) mention overseeing the political process. On the theory that awareness of functions tracks roughly the level of significance of each function, we note that Independents, Libertarians and other minor party voters find the overseeing of the political process as more important than do Republicans and Democrats.

One-fourth (24%) of those who are aware of the program are unaware of what it does.

**TABLE 4**

*"As far as you know, what does Clean Elections do? (PRE-CODE; RECORD ALL MENTIONS; PROBE: What else?"*

### Among Those With An Awareness of Clean Elections

|                                      | TOTAL | <u>Political Party</u> |          |                       |
|--------------------------------------|-------|------------------------|----------|-----------------------|
|                                      |       | Republican             | Democrat | Independent/<br>Other |
| Provides funding to candidates       | 37%   | 43%                    | 39%      | 38%                   |
| Police/oversee the electoral process | 25    | 21                     | 26       | 33                    |
| Endorse certain candidates           | 8     | 5                      | 11       | 9                     |
| Enforce contribution/spending limits | 8     | 10                     | 6        | 9                     |
| Lowers emission/cleans up pollution  | 4     | 4                      | 4        | 2                     |
| Other                                | 1     | 1                      | 1        | 0                     |
| Not sure                             | 24    | 21                     | 25       | 14                    |

Totals exceed 100% due to multiple responses

~~~~~

	Total	<u>GENDER</u>		<u>AGE</u>		
		Male	Female	Under 35	35 to 54	55 +
Provides funding to candidates	37%	42%	31%	44%	42%	29%
Police/oversee the electoral process	25	29	21	23	20	33
Endorse certain candidates	8	9	7	14	9	5
Enforce contribution/spending limits	8	8	8	0	10	10
Lowers emission/cleans up pollution	4	2	6	5	6	2
Other	1	1	1	0	0	2
Not sure	24	20	28	29	20	23

Totals exceed 100% due to multiple responses

~~~~~

## CREDIBILITY OF CLEAN ELECTIONS CANDIDATES

While six in ten (59%) feel that whether a candidate runs as a Clean Elections candidate or is privately funded makes no difference to the candidate's credibility. Among those who feel it makes a difference, those feeling a "clean" candidate is more credible outnumber those who feel the candidate is less credible by a 2½ - to-one margin.

Among Republicans, the more credible/less credible ratio narrows to virtually even.

TABLE 5

*"Do you feel a candidate who runs for office under Clean Elections guidelines and uses public funding is more credible or less credible than a candidate who raises his own money, or does it make no difference to you?"*

### Among Those With An Awareness of Clean Elections

|                        | More<br>Credible | No<br>Difference | Less<br>Credible | Not<br>Sure |
|------------------------|------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------|
| TOTAL                  | 25%              | 59%              | 10%              | 6%          |
| <u>GENDER</u>          |                  |                  |                  |             |
| Male                   | 26               | 61               | 8                | 5           |
| Female                 | 23               | 57               | 13               | 7           |
| <u>AGE</u>             |                  |                  |                  |             |
| Under 35               | 11               | 77               | 6                | 6           |
| 35 to 54               | 30               | 55               | 11               | 4           |
| 55+                    | 25               | 57               | 11               | 7           |
| <u>POLITICAL PARTY</u> |                  |                  |                  |             |
| Republican             | 17               | 63               | 15               | 5           |
| Democrat               | 32               | 55               | 8                | 5           |
| Independent/Other      | 29               | 59               | 6                | 6           |
| High Efficacy Voter    | 24               | 60               | 11               | 5           |
| <u>ETHNICITY</u>       |                  |                  |                  |             |
| Caucasian              | 26               | 58               | 10               | 6           |
| Hispanic               | 21               | 61               | 5                | 13          |
| Other                  | 18               | 66               | 12               | 4           |
| <u>COUNTY</u>          |                  |                  |                  |             |
| Maricopa               | 20               | 62               | 11               | 7           |
| Pima                   | 37               | 43               | 16               | 4           |
| Rural                  | 29               | 64               | 2                | 5           |

~~~~~

PENALTIES FOR VIOLATING CLEAN ELECTIONS

Respondents were asked what penalty is most appropriate for a “clean elections” candidate who violates the spending limit. Overall, just under half (46%) feel the candidate should be required to repay the amount spent that is over the limit, while three in ten (31%) feel the candidate should be removed from office.

As may be seen in Table 6, Republicans tend to be more lenient, while Democrats lean more toward more stringent measures.

TABLE 6

“When a candidate for office violates the spending limit, how should that person be penalized? Should they be removed from office, fined or be required to repay the amount that is over the limit?”

Among Those With An Awareness of Clean Elections

	TOTAL	<u>Political Party</u>		
		Republican	Democrat	Independent/ Other
Repay amount over limit	46%	58%	38%	46%
Remove from office	31	25	37	28
Fine	15	9	14	21
Do nothing	1	1	*	2
Unsure	7	7	11	3
	100%	100%	100%	100%

* Indicates less than .5 of one percent

	Total	<u>GENDER</u>		<u>AGE</u>		
		Male	Female	Under 35	35 to 54	55 +
Repay amount over limit	46%	44%	48%	49%	51%	39%
Remove from office	31	33	29	19	29	39
Fine	15	14	15	24	12	13
Do nothing	1	1	1	0	1	2
Unsure	7	8	7	8	7	7
	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%	100%

~~~~~

## IMPORTANCE OF THE CLEAN ELECTIONS ACT

When asked how important it is to the voters in Arizona that the Clean Elections Act continue, fully 85 percent indicate it is very (54%) or somewhat (31%) important. Among Democrats, support for continuation of the program is virtually universal.

**TABLE 7**

*“Do you think it is very important, somewhat important, not very important or not at all important to voters in Arizona that the Clean Election Act continue?”*

### Among Those With An Awareness of Clean Elections

|                        | Very<br>Important | Somewhat<br>Important | Not Very<br>Important | Not At All<br>Important | Not<br>Sure | NET*<br>IMPORTANT/<br>NOT<br>IMPORTANT |
|------------------------|-------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|-------------|----------------------------------------|
| TOTAL                  | 54%               | 31%                   | 6%                    | 4%                      | 5%          | <b>+ 75</b>                            |
| <u>GENDER</u>          |                   |                       |                       |                         |             |                                        |
| Male                   | 52                | 31                    | 8                     | 6                       | 3           | <b>+ 69</b>                            |
| Female                 | 55                | 31                    | 5                     | 2                       | 7           | <b>+79</b>                             |
| <u>AGE</u>             |                   |                       |                       |                         |             |                                        |
| Under 35               | 33                | 57                    | 2                     | 2                       | 6           | <b>+ 86</b>                            |
| 35 to 54               | 56                | 27                    | 9                     | 4                       | 4           | <b>+ 70</b>                            |
| 55+                    | 61                | 23                    | 7                     | 5                       | 4           | <b>+ 72</b>                            |
| <u>POLITICAL PARTY</u> |                   |                       |                       |                         |             |                                        |
| Republican             | 44                | 32                    | 12                    | 5                       | 7           | <b>+ 59</b>                            |
| Democrat               | 71                | 26                    | 1                     | 1                       | 1           | <b>+ 95</b>                            |
| Independent/Other      | 53                | 40                    | 4                     | 2                       | 1           | <b>+ 87</b>                            |
| High Efficacy Voter    | 59                | 25                    | 8                     | 5                       | 3           | <b>+ 71</b>                            |
| <u>ETHNICITY</u>       |                   |                       |                       |                         |             |                                        |
| Caucasian              | 51                | 32                    | 8                     | 3                       | 6           | <b>+ 72</b>                            |
| Hispanic               | 52                | 39                    | 0                     | 8                       | 1           | <b>+ 83</b>                            |
| Other                  | 74                | 18                    | 0                     | 8                       | 0           | <b>+ 84</b>                            |
| <u>COUNTY</u>          |                   |                       |                       |                         |             |                                        |
| Maricopa               | 50                | 34                    | 8                     | 5                       | 3           | <b>+ 71</b>                            |
| Pima                   | 52                | 26                    | 5                     | 5                       | 12          | <b>+ 68</b>                            |
| Rural                  | 68                | 27                    | 1                     | 2                       | 2           | <b>+ 92</b>                            |

\* Very important + somewhat important-not very important- not at all important = Net

~~~~~

Supporters of continuing the Clean Elections Act cite an honest electoral process, leveling the playing field, greater accountability and control, and a need to police the electoral process as the main reasons for supporting the Act's continuation.

TABLE 8

"What specifically makes you say that?"

Among Those With An Awareness of Clean Elections

<u>GENERAL POSITIVE (NET)</u>	<u>(45%)</u>
Honest basis for electoral process	26
Level playing field	16
Good idea/like it	9
Need to police electoral process	8
It's the way it should be	3
<u>FUNDING – FAVORABLE (NET)</u>	<u>(18%)</u>
Provides greater accountability/control	9
Reduces influence of special interests	5
Broadens candidate opportunities	5
Monitor fund use	1
Allow taxpayers to donate	1
<u>GENERAL NEGATIVE (NET)</u>	<u>(11%)</u>
Not working/needs improvement	4
Don't like it	4
People aren't attentive	2
Should not be violating	2
Bias limits choice of candidates	1
Other	2
<u>FUNDING – UNFAVORABLE (NET)</u>	<u>(4%)</u>
Invites abuse	2
Too many loopholes	2
Don't know	24

Total exceeds 100% due to multiple responses

~~~~~